

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 09/878,327	Applicant(s) ZHOU ET AL.	
	Examiner Sean Reilly	Art Unit 2153	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sean Reilly (Examiner). (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Michael Shea (Applicant's Representative). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 01/17/06.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
JASON CARDONE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner and Applicant discussed an overview of the invention. The scope and meaning of the term "mirror person" was discussed. Examiner and Applicant agreed that the term is never explicitly defined in Applicant's specification. Examiner maintains that the term while definite in view of Applicant's specification is extremely broad. Applicant was advised that in order to further prosecution Applicant should considering amending the claims to further define 1) the term "mirror persons" (such as specific attributes a mirror person must contain based on the LDAP user account) and 2) the steps involved in generating a mirror person.